Exclusive Text: How State Dept. Tried to Censor the SEPost on Franco Spain, Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 45 NOVEMBER 26, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

When Tito Jailed Djilas, He Destroyed Titoism

In the adjoining box, the reader will find the essence of three viewpoints now struggling for dominance in Eastern Europe. The outcome of this conflict of ideas is more important than anything else happening in the world today. Without socialism, the underdeveloped countries of the earth cannot hope to develop their basic resources and raise their living standards. The risks of development are too great, the resources of private capital too small, the enterprise of individual business men too haphazard, for so gigantic a task. But unless socialism can be disentangled in the minds of men from the horrors of the police state, particularly its Russian form, reaction may set in and hold back a whole generation. To try and clarify the ideas contesting for dominance in the Soviet zone is the most urgent political task of our time.

The first viewpoint, on which the Soviet leaders for all their differences seem in agreement, is to make as little change as possible, to muffle talk of destalinization. In Suslov's speech, commemorating the November Revolution, Stalin was no longer the monster that Khrushchev portrayed last February. He is now "a prominent Marxist" (has a sense of humor vanished from the land of Gogol?) who performed great service in fighting "enemies of the people," warning phrase. Yet somehow the cult of his personality led to "serious mistakes" (vague and growing vaguer) but now that "Leninist norms" have been restored, Party work is becoming "livelier" (had it been dull?) and the Soviet people are "rallying even closer (applause)" around their Communist Party. In this Panglossian best of all possible Marxist worlds, Molotov reappears to lecture artists on the need for "socialist realism" (not like that decadent Picasso) and Khrushchev hints to students that only those who toe the party line may get an education. These are again the lineaments of a regime of "gendarmes and bureaucrats" as the Petofi circle in Budapest so eloquently stigmatized it. But events will show it is no longer politically possible even in Russia, the happy land where there is always unanimity.

Tito's speech at Pula five days later reflected the more penetrating views of the Yugoslav dictator. This speech merits the closest study. The breath of reality moves through it. It begins to lift the curtain on Tito's mysterious sudden trip to Russia with Khrushchev. He found there "erroneous and defective views" of what was happening in East Europe, a ludicrous reliance still on that gamey old scoundrel Rakosi ("They said that . . . he is honest") and the folly of insisting that if he were replaced, Gero must succeed him. ("Not at all different from Rakosi" is Tito's description.) Tito gives us a glimpse of Hungary's impact on the Soviet leaders: "It has become crystal clear to them that not only the followers of Horthy, but also workers from factories and mines, the whole people are fighting in Hungary. Soviet soldiers are going into this fight with a heavy heart and unwillingly." The most damning remark of all came when Tito said there would have been no need for intervention if it were not that "they, unfortunately,

(*Continued on Page Four*)

Three Views In Conflict

"The cult of personality is connected, as is known, with the name of Stalin. The services and role of Stalin in the October Revolution, in socialist building, and in the struggle against the enemies of the people and the enemies of the working class are commonly known. Stalin was a prominent organizer and a prominent Marxist. Yet the cult of personality of Stalin brought about serious mistakes and numerous acts of violation of socialist legality. . . . Now, when the Lenin norms of Party life and the principles of the Soviet socialist democratism are being restored. . . . Party and Soviet work has become considerably livelier. . . . The entire Soviet people are rallying even closer around their own Communist Party. (Applause)."

—Suslov, main speaker at this year's celebration in Moscow on the eve of the anniversary of the Revolution, Nov. 6.

"It is not only a question of the cult of personality, but that of a system which rendered the emergence of the cult of personality possible. . . . It is there that the roots of the evil lie. . . . Where are these roots? They are to be found in the bureaucratic apparatus, in the methods of leadership and in the so-called one-man rule and in the ignoring of the role and wishes of the working masses."

—Tito's speech at Pula, November 11.

"Yugoslav national Communism was, above all, the resistance to Moscow of the Communist party, that is, of its leaders. Not that the people opposed this resistance, not that they did not support it and benefit from it—quite the contrary. But the interests and the initiative of the leaders played a crucial and leading role. . . . In Yugoslavia, therefore, the entire process was led and carefully controlled from above, and tendencies to go further—to democracy—were relatively weak. . . . Yugoslavia supported this discontent [in Eastern Europe] so long as it was conducted by Communist leaders, but turned against it—as in Hungary—as soon as it went further. . . . This revealed that Yugoslav national Communism was unable in its foreign policy to depart from its narrow ideological and bureaucratic class interests . . . it was ready to yield even those principles of equality and non-interference in internal affairs on which all its successes in the struggle with Moscow had been based."

—Milovan Djilas, once vice president of Tito's Yugoslavia, writing on "The Storm in Eastern Europe" (the New Leader, Nov. 19), an article for which he was jailed on Nov. 19.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Can We Support "National Communism" in East Europe, But Not East Asia?

What Happens to U.S. China Policy If Peking Demonstrates Independence?

What If Communist China "Rebels," Too? This is the question which most disturbs the already well-haunted slumbers of State Department officials. Last minute revisions in the text of speeches already made available for release have disclosed to the press corps that the Department is unable to make up its mind how to handle increasing evidence of Peking support for the Polish revolt against Moscow. The Department is afraid to have attention focussed on the wide and growing gap between our policy in East Europe and in East Asia. In East Europe, both the President and Secretary Dulles have made it clear that we are prepared to give friendly support to national communist movements which demonstrate some independence of the U.S.S.R. In East Asia, there are no such nuances of policy. There we are against Peking period, though it has long been clear that Communist China by sheer bulk and manpower was never a satellite in the East European sense, where Russians could act as a superior and occupying power. It is also well known that Mao came to power by disregarding Stalin's advice. What happens if some dramatic event makes Communist China's independence evident to the ordinary newspaper reader? How continue to throw good money after bad on Chiang Kai-shek? How avoid a fight with the China Lobby at home? The business community is already restive about the trade blockade of Red China, as may be seen in the box below, a major news story to which scant attention was paid in the press.

Fade-Out of A Hero: Saddest note of the week was the announcement on the real estate page of the *Washington Post* (Nov. 17) that "Harry P. Cain, former U.S. Senator from Washington and recent member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, has been appointed vice president of Indian Lake Estates, Florida, a resort area now under development by Leon Ackerman of Washington, D. C." Cain will operate from an office in Dayton, Ohio. The former Senator ruined himself with the Republicans by speaking out against security abuses; the Democrats were too cowardly to use him in the campaign and exploit the issue. Some of his friends had hoped that if the Democrats won, a place would be found for him in the new Administration. Cain sacrificed his career to his principles. He has had no profession other than that of public service since he was Mayor of Takoma, Washington, after the war. He is not a man of means and needed a job.

Shattered Monolith: The *Worker* last Sunday (Nov. 18) said its $50,000 fund appeal has slumped so badly "we do not know at the moment how to continue publication." A front page appeal admitted, "In part, the slump is due to the sharp divisions in political view among our readers. Many do not agree with the paper's position on events in Hungary, and are withholding support for this reason." A sample was a letter of protest published the preceding Friday which began, "Your editorial sharply condemning the Soviet Union for the use of the Red Army in Hungary ripped through me like a jagged knife cutting away at innards. It was a terrible piece." To meet the crisis the *Worker* printed an appeal from "four Communist Party leaders, who have differing viewpoints on issues vital for their party . . ." but united on the need for supporting the paper. The four were William Z. Foster, national chairman; Eugene Dennis, the General Secretary; Benjamin J. Davis, National Committeeman, and John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*. The admission, much less the existence, of sharp differences in the party hierarchy is something new in American Communist annals. Gates is the "liberal"; Foster the standpatter.

In Memoriam

As one who was a member of the staff of the Newspaper *PM*, we mourn the death of Marshall Field III. He was an unusual and admirable human being in his kindness, his instinctive sympathy for the less privileged, his troubled conscience over the great wealth to which he had been born, his sense of personal responsibility. It is something to remember that America's one independent non-conformist paper of the 40's was made possible by the heir to one of America's greatest fortunes. Field's vision gave Ralph Ingersoll's genius its chance, and to those who had the privilege of working on *PM* the news of Mr. Field's death was as the loss of an old and honored friend.

Buzzing Round The Capitol Dome: Democrats are gloomy and see control of the Senate soon passing to the Republicans; at least one elderly Democratic Senator is so ill that his death or retirement is expected momentarily, and a Republican Governor will name his successor, making the Senate 48-48. . . . The Democratic National Committee is bitter against Senator Gore of Tennessee, feels that he helped frighten campaign contributions away from his own party. . . . A fierce struggle is being waged behind the scenes to decide who shall succeed Dulles as Secretary of State; the G.O.P. "liberals" are backing Walter Bedell Smith, the right is grooming General Gruenther. . . . A bench made up of Judges Edgerton, Bazelon and Prettyman (2-1 liberal) heard the Rockwell Kent and Walter Briehl passport cases in the Court of Appeals here. . . . The Senate Judiciary hearing on the appointment of William J. Brennan to the U.S. Supreme Court will give the reactionaries on this committee a chance to punish him for a speech he made before a Boston Irish group during the height of the McCarthy furore attacking the witch hunt, and a later speech in New Jersey defending the Fifth Amendment and criticizing abuse of Congressional investigation. . . . Observers are puzzled by the sudden retirement of Martha M. Eliot, head of the Children's Bureau, immediately after her announcement of a committee to investigate the peril of radioactivity to children. . . . One way to hit back at the House Un-American Activities Committee is to lend a friendly hand to the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. The ACPFB and its devoted director, Abner Green, is for the umteenth time a target of Walter's alien-hating inquisitors. No hounded organization has done more to help the helpless than the ACPFB.

Big Business Spokesman (To The Left of Geo. Meany) Advocates Trade With Red China

Mr. [Wm.] McGaffin [Chicago Daily News]: "Well, as an advocate of world trade. . . . Would you be in favor of trade with Communist China?"

Mr. [John S.] Coleman [President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce]: "Yes, I am in favor of trading with Communist China. I feel that in the case of Communist China, if China wants to trade in those materials that are non-strategic in their nature, that we should trade."

Mr. [Jim] Lucas [Moderator]: "What is a non-strategic material, Mr. Coleman?"

Mr. Coleman: "Well, a non-strategic material would be one . . . that could not be readily converted so that it could be used against you in armed conflict."

Mr. McGaffin: "Well, it would require a revision of present laws to permit even that much trade?"

Mr. Coleman: "I think it would, yes, sir."

Mr. [Ernest K.] Lindley [Washington Chief, Newsweek]: "Are you suggesting that our trade with Red China should be put on the same basis as our trade with Russia and the Eastern European satellites?"

Mr. Coleman: "Approximately, yes."

—Reporters Roundup from Washington, Sun., Nov. 18

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Exclusive Documentary: Text of A Letter Showing One Form of Governmental Crypto-Censorship

How Pentagon and State Dept. Tried to Censor SEP Article on Spain

Bureaucracy is bureaucracy the world over, and the State Department if it could get away with it would act exactly as does the Foreign Office in Moscow. As it is, State Department and Pentagon operate through 57 sour varieties of crypto-censorship to restrict freedom of the press. One way is to get correspondents who touch on military matters to submit their copy voluntarily for security clearance, and then take advantage of the opportunity to suggest policy changes. Publications which resist this treatment find difficulties in negotiating for permission to send correspondents to military bases, naval exercises, etc., and may be barred from off the record briefings as "unreliable."

Rarely has it been possible to document such methods of indirect censorship. But on Thursday, Nov. 15, the Moss subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee came up with a prize exhibit. This subcommittee has been studying government information policies. It made public a letter in which Pentagon and State Department tried to force general revision of an article written for the *Saturday Evening Post* by James P. O'Donnell after a visit to U.S. air bases in Spain. They thought it might offend Franco.

The article was submitted Nov. 18, 1955, and published Jan. 28, 1956, by the *Post* despite these objections and with only one non-security change (see below). We believe evidence of an attempt to censor America's foremost family weekly is news, but few papers seemed to agree and none printed the letter sent the *Saturday Evening Post,* so we are making it available here.

Sample SEP "Indelicacy"

"There was one sticky problem, however, that General Kissner and the Spanish tried to negotiate by sailing a bit too close to the wind. Spain is a Roman Catholic country, and church, or canon, law is the law of the land—above all in such civic matters as marriage. Most Spanish girls are baptized Catholics. . . . Most of the American airmen, however . . . are Protestant. General Kissner requested, and seemed about to get a "procedural agreement' governing mixed marriages. The delicate powwows were secret. . . . It is hard to say in Spain where the government ends and the Church begins. . . . When the New York Times broke this story on Christmas Sunday morning, 1954, things were really in the fan. American Protestant Churchmen blew a loud whistle, heard all the way from Washington to Madrid. The negotiations were dropped. . . ."

—James P. O'Donnell, "The American Invasion of Spain," Saturday Evening Post, Jan. 28, 1956.

The letter itself only embodies part of a detailed memorandum criticizing the article. This memo was declared "classified" so it could be kept from Congressional investigators. We suggest that the Moss committee ought to follow this up by canvassing U.S. magazines and newspapers generally to try and learn how many similar cases have occurred. What happens with editors who have less character, or are in a weaker position than the SEP? We will be reporting further on this investigation, and on the Coolidge report with which the Pentagon is trying to head it off but here is the letter:

Text of the "Security Review" Letter to the Saturday Evening Post

[*From*] *Office of Ass't Secretary of Defense*
[*To*] *Mr. Hugh Morrow, Assoc. Editor, Saturday Evening Post* *16 December 1955*

Dear Mr. Morrow:

The Department of Defense and the Department of State agree that publication of the O'Donnell article in the Post would seriously react against the national security interests at this time of the United States. We feel there is a possibility that publication of this article would be considered offensive by Spanish authorities to the point that U.S. interests in Spain might be prejudiced.

"Overall Approach" Called Wrong

Our objections lie more in the overall approach than in specific details. Certainly the piece could be quickly cleared up insofar as military security is concerned. It is the rather sneering approach to the problems and limitations of the Spanish people about which we are greatly dubious.

For example, herewith are some comments which we have been authorized to send along from the Department of State, and I might add that they reflect my thinking also:

"O'Donnell, himself, recognizes this Spanish trait but then proceeds throughout the article to make jibes and cheap remarks at the expense of the Spaniards—in substance to question their technical ability, their war-making potential and even their honesty. A few specific examples will suffice:

'Franco, that Cincinnatus with no plow to go home to . . .'

'Spain was declared a pariah country by the united Nations, an outfit including such history-making peoples as the Afghans and the Byelorussians.'

'. . . the penalty for premature anti-communism curiously severe.' (This comment is typical of the article, in that reference is obscure).

'. . . second place in the Iberian League.' (This would seem to be a promotion of Portugal that would be particularly galling.)

'In this corner the Americans, who believe that time is money, over against the Spanish who regard making money as a waste of time.'

Tough World for Senoritas

'For a Spanish senorita to make a decent marriage today, she has either to be born rich, win the national lottery, or latch onto a successful bullfighter.' [Of all the remarks objected to, this was the only one which did not appear in the final article when it was published last Jan. 28—IFS.]

'Some graft there may have been, since Franco's reputation for honesty does not extend to prominent members of his entourage.'

'. . . a pastoral, donkey economy.'

'. . . a country where filling stations are rarer than cathedrals.'

'. . . it is ludicrous to conceive, in a wartime situation, of Spanish pilots mounting to ward off Soviet bombers while our jet Hot Shots stay back in the barracks playing canasta.'

"The above is just a sample. Mr. O'Donnell has not missed a single chance to insult the Spaniards in their most sensitive spots, and if occasionally accuracy is sacrificed, he seems to feel that the purpose condones this. A good example of this technique is the crack about gas stations in relation to cathedrals, which is a wild exaggeration."

The Department of Defense recommends deletion of the following on the grounds of strict military security:

a. Last sentence, page xxxxxxxx.
b. Last sentence, first paragraph, page xxxxxxx.

Sincerely, Lee Hargus
Acting Director, Office of Security Review

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tito Wouldn't Even Let Djilas Write Freely Several Thousand Miles Away

In Yugoslavia, Too, Only One Point of View Is Permitted

(*Continued from Page One*)

still believe that military power solves everything." It is no wonder that *Pravda* reacted violently; this shatters the Kremlin's idealized image of itself.

Yet when the chips are down Tito feels obliged to stand by this same leadership. This is why the Pula speech appalled the Poles. When the Hungarian revolt demanded free elections, it struck at the foundations of his regime as well as theirs. He is against Soviet intervention; he fought it hard in his own country; but he approves it in Hungary if the alternative is the overthrow of the communist dictatorship, *even if this is what the overwhelming majority of the people want.* Tito admits in the speech that in excusing Soviet intervention he is being inconsistent. But, he asks unhappily, "what is the lesser evil, chaos, a civil war, a counter-revolution and a new world, or the intervention of the Soviet troops which were there?" He adds, "If this saves socialism in Hungary, then we will be able to say, Comrades, that . . . the Soviet intervention was necessary." But what if it doesn't? Has it not already shattered the Communist movement the world over? Can socialism be built with bayonets? Can Russian soldiers run striking Hungarian factories? Can Poland trust Soviet soldiers on its soil when this is how they will act in a crisis? What happens to the keystone of Marxism-Leninism, the idea of a temporary dictatorship of the toiling masses over a small minority of the exploiters, when one sees nakedly the dictatorship of a foreign power over a whole rebellious people, including its own Army and its own Communist party?

Tito is closer to the people than the heavy-handed Kremlin bureaucrats, insulated from reality by their own propaganda and security apparatus. But Tito is no more disposed than they to translate his sharply analytical words into actual reforms when his own power is threatened. He said at Pula that they acted as they did because they were afraid of reactionary forces in East Europe and did not have "sufficient confidence in the internal revolutionary forces of these countries." He felt that this lack of faith was "at the root of all the later mistakes." But he showed the same lack of faith and made the same kind of mistakes when eight days later he arrested his old comrade-in-arms Djilas for a critical article in the *New Leader* last week. Tito said at Pula that the evil lies not with "the cult of personality" but with the system that makes it possible. Djilas, unlike Tito, has gone one step forward and discussed the question of what, then, does one do to reform the system? Djilas fell from favor several years ago when he advocated abolition of the one-party system.

This, the third and militarily weakest of the three ideas struggling for dominance in East Europe, will ultimately prove the strongest. Titoism is only valid as a half-way house. Socialism cannot cleanse itself of the evils of Stalinism until it is willing to abide by the majority will, to persuade rather than to coerce, to accept a step backward if necessary to prove its democratic sincerity. What is "popular democracy" but a fraud if the people are free to discuss only one point of view, the Party's, with a capital P, like the G in God? Tito betrayed himself and all who looked to him for leadership when he jailed Djilas. If Titoism will not allow such questions to be discussed even several thousand miles away in an obscure right-wing Socialist publication few Yugoslavs (and not too many Americans) ever see, then Titoism is not different enough from Stalinism to be a model for the future of East Europe. Tito has demontsrated Djilas's point. The one party system is the evil. If the Revolution after all these years is still afraid of the popular will, it is time something better were constructed.

Readers Are Invited

Readers of the *Weekly* in the New York area are invited to attend a special meeting in the Community Church, 40 E. 35th Street, Manhattan, on the night of Friday, Dec. 14, the eve of the anniversary of the Bill of Rights. Events in Eastern Europe have given new meaning to the basic freedoms and safeguards embodied in it. How can these be carried over into Socialist society? To discuss this question the *Weekly* invited a group of independent Left and Socialist publications to participate in a panel to discuss "The Meaning of the Bill of Rights: Socialism and Democracy: East and West" and to answer questions put from the floor. Invitations were sent to *Liberation*, the *Monthly Review*, the *Militant*, *Labor Action*, the *American Socialist* and the *Socialist Call* in the belief that it would be interesting to hear their diverse points of view. All but the *Socialist Call* have so far accepted the invitation. I. F. Stone will be moderator, and it is hoped to have a minimum of speech-making and a maximum of fraternal discussion. We want especially to hear from our readers; full opportunity will be given the audience as well as the panel.

IFS Speaks in Boston on Eastern Europe for The Community Church Next Sunday (Dec. 2)

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....
11/26/56

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED